

**From:** [webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk) <[webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:webmaster@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 01 March 2021 20:46

**To:** Planning <[planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:planning@ribblevalley.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Form completion: Planning Application Comments Form

#### FORM DETAILS

*Web Ref No:* 24107

*Form:* Planning Application Comments Form

*Completed:* 01/03/2021 20:46:28

*Status:* Pending

-----

#### USER DETAILS

*Site user email:* Unregistered user

-----

#### USER INPUTS

*title:* [REDACTED]

*LastName:* [REDACTED]

*firstName:* [REDACTED]

*numberName:* [REDACTED]

*postAddress:* [REDACTED]

*postCode:* [REDACTED]

*refNo:* 3/2021/0167

*addDev:* 2 Bridge End Whalley Road Billington BB7 9NU

*comments:* I write to give comment on application number 3/2021/0167. The comments relate only to the external walkway aspect of development, along with a sun terrace shown on the drawings that does not benefit previous consent. â€¢ The red line submitted by the applicant is inaccurate. The adjacent property (4 Bridge End) owns the freehold interest of a part of the application site, comprising the rear passageway behind 2 Bridge End and also a significant element of garden space currently included within the applicantâ€™s red line. Land registry title documents numbered LA704864, LA770932, LAN161092 can be obtained from Land Registry and demonstrate this. The applicant does not own a freehold interest in any of the passageway to the rear. â€¢ The submission of certificate A is incorrect. The applicant should have served Certificate B on the owner of 4 Bridge End. This has not happened and consequently consent of this application would not be legal. â€¢ There are two title plans for 2 Bridge End numbered LA704864 and LA770932. Whilst a garage has been extended with consent into land included within the second title deed (previously agricultural), the land within that deed cannot be accessed directly from the land originally linked to the domestic property. It has no benefit of change of use to form garden space for 2 Bridge End. The land within the second title is accessed from what is assumed to be council land on Moor Lane. â€¢ There is no right of way to access the land to the rear through the passageway and no airspace lease is granted to the air above. â€¢ A new hardstanding within the land to the rear has been established within the last 12 months after structural-works, previous to this the earth was collapsed and not accessible for some 12

months. The application cites a sun terrace, there has been no continuous use of the hard standing at the rear as a sun terrace for 10 years and no certificate of lawfulness has been awarded. Therefore, the sun terrace cited as existing is unlawful. It is generally accepted that balconies, roof gardens and first floor patios can adversely affect the privacy of neighbours and can be deemed unacceptable. The hardstanding to the land at the rear has serious overlooking implications on the dining room, kitchen and rear yard of 4 Bridge End. This appears to contravene policy H10. If this space is connected to the domestic property directly as an active garden, the situation will be amplified. Note withdrawn application number 3/2008/102 includes parish council comments that reference a proposed roof terrace to Number 2 as detrimentally affecting Number 4. The withdrawn application was re-submitted without terrace. The bridge link increases the extent of overlooking beyond that within the withdrawn application. The underside of the proposed walkway will create a hiding space within the curtilage of 4 Bridge end on the rear approach to the dwelling. The rear is utilised in normal circumstances daily. The fence currently in place is for the Health and Safety benefit of the occupier whilst the wall to the rear is rectified after collapse due to a flood event. The proposed high-level walkway to Number 4 will create a space susceptible to antisocial behaviour and leave the occupants of Number 4 vulnerable to attack. Please note that I do not oppose the principle of the application in regard to the interior of the dwelling, but the overall design detrimentally affects the right to privacy, quiet enjoyment and accessibility of Number 4 Bridge End.